UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
28th meeting
held on
Thursday, 18 November 1993
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 28th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.28
7 January 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

93-82486 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

1. Mr. SVOBODA (Czech Republic) said that his delegation welcomed and supported the proposal by France and Sweden for a conference to review Protocol II to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (the inhumane weapons convention). It shared the concern expressed in the Committee with regard to the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines particularly in internal conflicts, a practice which seemed to be increasing in Eastern Europe. As only 35 countries had so far acceded to the Convention, his delegation was in favour of the early convening of the proposed review conference, which, in addition to providing an opportunity for a closer examination by the international community of the use of anti-personnel mines, booby traps and similar weapons, could draw attention to the Convention and its purposes. Input could also be sought from experts of countries which had not acceded to the Convention, and for that purpose some of the conference's subsidiary bodies might be open-ended.

2. Ms. MASON (Canada), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1, noted that it drew attention to the continuing impact of changes in the international environment on the question of verification and called for an in-depth examination by a group of experts of the lessons of recent United Nations verification experience and other relevant international developments with regard to verification. Her delegation strongly believed that efforts to strengthen the non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament mechanisms, including verification, could play a valuable role in a new international order and that the United Nations must be central to such efforts. One area in which important work could be done was in exploring the ways in which verification could contribute to conflict management and confidence-building by the United Nations. In recent years, more and more United Nations peace-keeping forces had been mandated to perform disarmament-related tasks including verification. Moreover, new practical experience in weapons-related fact-finding and on-site inspections was being acquired in a variety of contexts. Most of those activities were being planned and conducted on an ad hoc basis. Given those new developments and new emphasis, a follow-up study on verification could provide a useful opportunity to learn from recent experience and to develop ideas for future efforts in that area.

3. The focus of verification questions was also changing. Much more attention was now being given to non-proliferation and arms control in regional, local and even intra-State situations. An examination of how the tools of verification could most usefully be employed in those contexts, what new methods and approaches might be needed, and how verification and compliance-monitoring could contribute to the broader goals of maintaining peace and security were among the questions such a study could address. In Canada's view, the proposed study was entirely consistent with the draft resolution on compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements (A/C.1/48/L.47) which had been adopted by the First Committee earlier in the week and offered a practical means of contributing to the objectives set out in that draft resolution.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

4. Many delegations had asked what the effect of the proposed new study would be on the set of 16 verification principles developed by the United Nations Disarmament Commission and endorsed by the General Assembly in 1988. It was Canada's view that those principles remained valid; at the same time, however, it was appropriate to explore whether additional principles and guidelines might be needed to address the new requirements of the present-day world. The proposed study could examine such possibilities and make suggestions, which could then be referred to a global forum such as the Disarmament Commission for further consideration.

5. It was important to view verification as a process with a variety of informational inputs. Different sources of compliance-related information and different monitoring methods could provide complementary data that could make overall verification stronger and possibly more cost-effective. That too was an area where a follow-up study might contribute usefully.

6. Reviewing the conclusions of the 1990 Group of Experts did not mean duplication of work but, on the contrary, building upon that earlier work. Learning from recent developments could add to the results of the 1990 study and broaden the understanding of Member States in ways that would pave the way for more meaningful deliberations on the appropriate role of the United Nations in the field of verification.

7. It was also important to undertake the study because of a fragmentation of views which had appeared among previously like-minded countries on the subject of verification and the role in it of the United Nations. That difference of views extended even to the definition of verification, with some States seeking to distinguish between verification and compliance-monitoring. In Canada's view, a follow-up study could help bridge that gap between views and provide a foundation for an enhanced consensus on the subject.

8. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 on regional disarmament, said that the global and regional approaches to disarmament were complementary and should be pursued in tandem. Moreover, there was increasing appreciation of the fact that the regional approach to disarmament was an essential element in the search for disarmament and peace, and that the security problems of States needed to be given further consideration in a regional framework. The Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement had recognized, at their tenth summit meeting in 1992, that security problems were region-specific and were best addressed within an appropriate regional context.

9. Using the guidelines formulated by the Disarmament Commission earlier in 1993 as a starting-point, a sincere effort had been made to merge draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/48/L.28. The effort had been unsuccessful because essential concepts contained in the two draft resolutions could not be assimilated in a single text. The sponsors of the first draft resolution would be ready to work for a merger by the next session of the General Assembly, on the clear understanding that there should be no dilution of the core concepts contained in either draft resolution merely for the sake of achieving a merger.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

10. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 largely followed the lines of General Assembly resolution 47/52 J, which had received overwhelming support in the General Assembly in 1992, and its co-sponsors hoped it would receive as much or more support in 1993.

11. Introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1, he said that it was clear that arms races and conflicts in various parts of the world were being fuelled not by global disputes but by regional discord and tensions between States, and that conventional arms control measures must therefore be vigorously pursued at the regional and subregional levels in the interests of lowering tension. Moreover, although conventional arms control measures had been initiated in many areas, they had been disappointingly limited in scope and impact. A major reason for the lack of progress at the regional level was that concerned parties were usually unable to agree on basic principles which should govern negotiations on the issue. The best way to encourage meaningful negotiations on regional arms control was therefore to develop widely accepted principles on the basis of which talks might be held. The Conference on Disarmament, which was the single multilateral negotiating forum and worked on the basis of consensus, was well situated to do that. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1 incorporated those ideas and proposals and would no doubt give a much needed impetus to negotiations on conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels. Its sponsors therefore hoped that the Committee would give it the broadest possible support and that follow-up action would subsequently be taken on it in the interests of both regional and international peace and security.

12. Mr. GONZALEZ (Mexico), speaking in support of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1, said that verification in all its aspects had been a significant concern of the international community, and it was his delegation's belief that the role of the United Nations in verification should be strengthened, particularly in view of the changed international situation. The draft resolution was modest in scope and pointed in the right direction. His delegation urged all representatives to support it.

Draft resolutions in cluster 6

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1

13. Mr. MEHR (Afghanistan) said that at the request of another delegation, it had been agreed that the title of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1 submitted by Afghanistan should be amended to read: "Measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms". For the sake of consistency, the third preambular paragraph should also be amended along those lines. In the interest of rationalizing the work of the Committee, further consultations had been held with a view to consolidating the two draft resolutions on international arms transfers, which in the view of his delegation, were identical in substance. However, the sponsors of the two draft resolutions (A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1 and L.31/Rev.1) had been unable to reconcile their positions, although they had finally agreed that the two texts were complementary. In conclusion, he informed the Committee that Cambodia had also become a sponsor of the draft resolution and expressed the hope that it would be adopted without a vote.

14. Mr. GALEANO (Paraguay) requested that his country's name be deleted from the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1.

15. Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) regretted that it had not been possible to reach agreement on the consolidation of the two draft resolutions in question. In the view of his delegation, draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1 was broader in scope and summarized the issues at stake in a more balanced fashion than draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1. If the delegation of Afghanistan insisted that action be taken on its draft resolution, a number of amendments would be advisable. Firstly, the word "developing" should be deleted from the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2. Moreover, the latter should be further amended to the effect that the Secretary-General should seek the views of Governments on effective ways and means for collecting illegally distributed weapons in the countries which so requested.

16. Mr. PONCE (Ecuador) said that draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1, of which his country was a sponsor, sought a comprehensive solution to the problem of illicit arms trafficking and suggested that the matter should be taken up in an appropriate forum, namely the Disarmament Commission. The draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Afghanistan dealt with only one side of the issue and laid too great an emphasis on the situation of developing countries, whereas illicit arms trafficking was a problem common to all regions. He therefore endorsed the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1 proposed by the Cuban representative.

17. Mr. NGO DINH KHA (Viet Nam) also expressed support for the amendments proposed by the representative of Cuba.

18. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) endorsed the amendments proposed by the representative of Cuba; in its present form draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1 was discriminatory, since it implied that arms were illegally distributed in developing countries only, which was certainly not the case.

19. Mr. GONZALEZ (Mexico) expressed support for draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1, as orally amended by the Cuban representative.

20. Mr. NKURLU (Tanzania), referring to the addition to paragraph 2 proposed by the Cuban representative, suggested that in the English version it would best be rendered: "in those countries which so request ...".

21. Mr. GALVEZ (Peru) endorsed the oral amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1 proposed by the representatives of Cuba and Tanzania respectively.

22. Following a discussion in which Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) and the CHAIRMAN took part, Mr. MEHR (Afghanistan) proposed that action on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1 should be deferred, pending consultations among delegations on the various amendments proposed.

23. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1

24. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Kenya, Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1.

25. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

26. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1 was adopted by 143 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.*

---

* The delegation of Afghanistan subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Announcement of sponsorship

27. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolutions listed: A/C.1/48/L.32: Malta; A/C.1/48/L.40: Burundi, Comoros, Kuwait, Mauritania, Niger and Seychelles.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42

28. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the delegations of Azerbaijan, Cameroon, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Greece, Guyana, Iceland, Israel, Latvia, Lesotho, Malta, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Panama, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

29. Mr. ZIADDIN (Bangladesh), Mr. ANOH (Côte d'Ivoire), Mr. VALENZUELA (Honduras), Mr. ATABEKOV (Kyrgyzstan) and Mr. TAAPOPI (Namibia) requested that the names of their delegations should be included among the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42.

30. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42 was adopted without a vote.

Explanations of vote or position

31. Mr. WESTON (United Kingdom), explaining the position of his delegation and that of France on resolution A/C.1/48.L.42, said they strongly supported international action on the indiscriminate laying of non-self-destructing mines. However, Protocol II to the inhumane weapons convention permitted self-destructing or self-neutralizing anti-personnel mines as legitimate forms of self-defence if directed at military targets. Possession of those mines should not be restricted to countries with the capacity to manufacture them because they did not fall within the scope of the resolution.

32. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America), explaining his delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48.L.27/Rev.1, said that the revision of the draft resolution had precluded his Government's support for it, in that operative paragraph 4, as revised, would prejudice the decision about adding a new item to the 1994 agenda of the Disarmament Commission. His Government likewise rejected the expansion of the United Nations register of Conventional Arms to include illicit arms traffic; that was inappropriate and unfeasible, since such transfers were by nature secret and not reportable in a register format.

33. Mr. HU Xiaodi (China) said that had there been a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42, his delegation would have abstained. His Government understood the desire to avoid the killing of civilians by land mines, but oversimplified measures limited to halting the export of those weapons could not solve the problem. Since it was the legitimate right of States to obtain weapons for self-defence, his Government could not support the draft resolution.

34. Mr. KVOK (Russian Federation) said that his Government had supported the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42 on humanitarian grounds, and on the understanding that the moratorium would not affect the export contracts already concluded nor deliveries of mines for use by Russian troops

(Mr. Kvok, Russian Federation)

stationed in other countries with the consent of those countries, or deliveries of anti-personnel mines to countries with which his Government had entered into treaties on collective security.

35. Mr. BANDURA (Ukraine), speaking in explanation of position on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 6, said that in resolving problems related to arms transfers account must be taken both of the need to maintain international peace and security and of the economic and foreign policy interests of all States. A positive attitude should be taken to arms supplies when they promoted self-defence and participation in regional or other collective measures stemming from decisions of the United Nations or other international bodies. At the same time, reliable multilateral barriers to arms exports were needed in cases where such exports would promote continuation of armed conflicts, regional destabilization support of international terrorism or interference in the affairs of sovereign States. Adoption of decisions on arms exports was the prerogative of competent national bodies, with the exception of Security Council decisions on specific sanctions. Controversial issues relating to arms exports should be resolved through bilateral or multilateral consultations. His Government had instituted a tight system of export controls. Its policy was in line with the provisions of the resolutions in cluster 6, and his delegation had therefore supported them.

36. Mr. SELVAGGI (Italy), explaining his delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42, said that after the adoption by the Italian Parliament in 1990 of one of the world's strictest laws on arms transfers, his country's arms exports had been reduced by half. The draft resolution was a positive step towards banning the export of anti-personnel land mines, and his delegation had therefore voted in favour of it. Further multilateral discussions were needed to define more precisely which types of arms should be subject to export restrictions. The forthcoming Conference to review the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons could be the appropriate forum for discussion of that matter.

37. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan), said that though his delegation had joined the consensus resolution A/C.1/48/L.42 on humanitarian grounds, but believed it had shortcomings, had prevented Pakistan from becoming a co-sponsor. The moratorium on export addressed the supply side of the anti-personnel mine problem, but did not tackle the issue of stockpiling, use and production. That could lead to a monopoly of the use of those weapons by a few countries, an inequitable and inherently flawed arrangement. His delegation would have preferred a more comprehensive approach to the issue of uncleared anti-personnel mines, including training measures for concerned countries, measures to improve mine-clearance technology and strengthening of legal norms for mine use. Issues relating to self-neutralizing mines should also be considered. He urged the sponsors to submit to the General Assembly next year more comprehensive and balanced measures.

38. Mr. GOONETILLEKE (Sri Lanka) said although his delegation had supported the draft resolution, it was concerned by several unresolved problems. The resolution introduced a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel mines, but did not deal with production and use. Moreover, it was designed to prevent Governments which had legitimate reasons for doing so from importing such mines,

(Mr. Goonetilleke, Sri Lanka)

whereas experience showed that mines were often used indiscriminately by non-State entities such as falling into the hands of militant groups. Nor did the resolution address the problem of local manufacture and use of names by militant groups, and the moratorium might also encourage Governments to manufacture anti-personnel mines locally. His delegation hoped that in future the Committee would address those broader issues.

39. Mr. GONZALEZ (Mexico) said that his delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42 because it was a step in the direction of the ultimate prohibition of anti-personnel mines and their destruction. However, the resolution attempted to solve only part of the problem, ignoring the stockpiling of such mines. In his delegation's view, the most effective way of dealing with the issue would be international agreement on legal instrument of universal scope prohibiting the manufacture of mines and providing for the destruction of stockpiles. That objective would best be achieved by revising Protocol II to the inhumane weapons convention.

40. Mr. SHOUKRY (Egypt) said his delegation had participated in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42, although it would have preferred a fuller treatment of the subject. Export restrictions alone would not achieve the desired results, and echoing the comments of several other delegations, he said that a resolution dealing with the production and use of anti-personnel mines would have been preferable. It was also important that the moratorium on exports should not obstruct the legitimate concerns of Governments with regard to self-defence.

41. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that his delegation had supported the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42 on humanitarian grounds. However, he wished to reiterate one of his Government's basic policy positions: peace-building in the post-cold-war era should not mean some States could be entrusted with weapons while others could not. Non-discrimination was a basic factor in the maintenance of peace. Moreover, it would have been preferable for the resolution to cover the production, use and stockpiling of anti-personnel mines, as well as their export.

Draft resolutions in cluster 10

42. Mr. ZALVAR (Brazil), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the guidelines of the Disarmament Commission on regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security were balanced and forward-looking, and his delegation had expected the General Assembly to build on the solid ground they provided. Regrettably, however, neither the letter nor spirit of those guidelines had been fully reflected in the Committee's work. A single draft resolution which could have been approved by consensus would have been preferable to the three texts now before the Committee.

43. His delegation, while supporting draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28, would have preferred to see the balance achieved at the 1993 session of the Disarmament Commission retained in the text. Any document addressing regional disarmament issues should thoroughly reflect the Commission's agreed principles, particularly principles 13, 18, 25 and 30.

(Mr. Zalvar, Brazil)

44. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 repeated almost exactly the text of resolutions approved by recorded vote in previous years, without taking recent developments fully into account. His delegation would have preferred a merger with draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28.

45. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38 ran directly counter to the Disarmament Commission's guidelines and recommendations: his delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on it.

46. Mr. HOFFMAN (Germany) said that the main purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 was to endorse the guidelines and recommendations on regional approaches to disarmament adopted by consensus in the Disarmament Commission and that his delegation regarded it as a true merger of all resolutions introduced in the Committee in previous years on regional disarmament. Accordingly, no additional resolution on the subject was needed, and his delegation was therefore not, as it had been in the past, a sponsor of the text contained in draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36. However, it had no major difficulties with its contents and would vote in favour of it.

47. His delegation welcomed the operative part of document A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1, and would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. However, it had serious doubts as to the compatibility of the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs and with the guidelines for regional approaches to disarmament adopted by the Disarmament Commission. It was questionable whether the fifth paragraph contributed to the cooperative spirit of all partners: responsibility for regional security was indivisible, and should not be relegated to particular States. The sixth preambular paragraph singled out an objective of conventional arms control which would not necessarily improve security. A principal objective for conventional arms control in that context should be equal security for all partners at the lowest possible level of armaments. If the two paragraphs were voted on separately, his delegation would therefore vote against the fifth preambular paragraph and abstain on the sixth preambular paragraph.

48. Mr. CHANDRA (India) said that draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1 was seriously flawed, since it failed to take account of the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security, which stipulated, inter alia: that regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should be open to the participation of all States concerned and agreed freely among them on the basis of the principle of the sovereign equality of all States concerned and should take into account the specific conditions and characteristics of the region; that States participating in regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should define the region to which the arrangements among them applied; that regional approaches to disarmament and arms limitation should take into account the necessity to address broader, non-military factors which might affect security; and that regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should address in all its aspects the question of the accumulation of conventional weapons beyond the legitimate self-defence requirements of States.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

49. Not only were those ideas not mentioned in the draft resolution, but conceptually, it ran counter to them by approaching the issue on a narrow one-dimensional plane on which it could not possibly succeed, instead of holistically and within a broad political and military framework.

50. Moreover, in contending that States with larger military capabilities had a special responsibility for promoting such agreements, it ignored the fact that such States often had wider security problems and concerns and that each State must contribute equally to regional security to the maximum extent of its means.

51. His delegation, furthermore, could not accept the primacy of place in the disarmament agenda which the draft resolution appeared to give to conventional arms control. It believed that nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction posed the most serious threat to international peace and security and that the efforts of the international community should be focused on containing that threat. The request to the Conference on Disarmament to formulate principles that could serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control was therefore unfortunate, particularly at a time when the Conference would be fully stretched in the comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty negotiations and possibly in negotiations for the cessation of the production of fissile materials for weapons and nuclear explosive devices. Above all, given the fact that regional arrangements were region-specific, the exercise of the Conference on Disarmament on that issue would be futile and would merely duplicate the excellent work already done in that field by the Disarmament Commission.

52. Likewise, draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 largely ignored the Commission's guidelines and recommendations. For example, while the Commission's guidelines recognized that regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should contribute to regional security and stability at the lowest possible level of armaments and armed forces and on the basis of undiminished security for all participating States, the draft resolution focused on the security of smaller States and contended that the enhancement thereof would reduce the risk of regional conflicts. In his view, it was more realistic to recognize that the security concerns of all States, large and small, must be equally addressed in order to reduce the risk of regional conflicts. Furthermore, the draft resolution sought to address nuclear non-proliferation at both the regional and subregional levels. His delegation believed that nuclear non-proliferation was a global issue which could only be dealt with effectively on a global basis.

53. For those reasons, his delegation would abstain on both of the draft resolutions.

54. Mr. GALVEZ (Peru) said that his delegation had withdrawn its draft decision on regional conventional disarmament (A/C.1/48/L.4) in a spirit of compromise and because the thrust of the decision was contained in draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 on regional disarmament, which acknowledged the importance of the Commission's guidelines and recommendations. It therefore noted with regret that a number of delegations which had supported the merging of draft decision A/C.1/48/L.4 and draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 also supported draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1, in which some of the earlier gains had been lost. For the sake of consistency, therefore, his delegation would abstain in the vote on

(Mr. Galvez, Peru)

draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1, and it reserved the right the following year to promote the adoption of a draft resolution on regional conventional arms control based on a broad consensus. The current international climate required the urgent strengthening of regional mechanisms of cooperation, confidence-building and disarmament so that the resources made available from conventional arms control at the regional level could be earmarked for priority areas of development.

55. Mr. PONCE (Ecuador) said that, while his delegation had traditionally supported all efforts to promote disarmament and confidence-building measures at the regional and subregional levels, it would abstain on the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1 because the draft introduced concepts which were unclear and which ignored the consensus on regional disarmament achieved in the Disarmament Commission after several years of efforts.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28

56. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that Cape Verde, Haiti, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28.

57. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36

58. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had been joined by Albania, Armenia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela and Zimbabwe.

59. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama,

Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: India.

60. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1

61. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that Haiti, Panama and Swaziland had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

62. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Singapore, Slovakia, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

63. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1 was adopted by 123 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

64. Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 because the draft acknowledged the important work which had been done in the Disarmament Commission. The guidelines and recommendations elaborated by the Commission fully reflected the interests of all States, and acknowledged the link between nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament at the global and regional levels. They also provided for participation by regional States in regional disarmament arrangements and drew attention to the danger of the excessive accumulation of weapons beyond the legitimate defence needs of a State.

65. His delegation therefore considered that it was unnecessary and even counterproductive to have introduced draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 on a subject which had been so comprehensively covered in the Commission's guidelines and recommendations. The draft resolution, moreover, was not balanced, since it failed to provide for initiatives and participation by all regional States in regional arrangements for disarmament. While his delegation had supported it on the grounds that it contained some useful elements, he hoped that similar drafts would in future reflect the balance that had been achieved during the negotiations in the Disarmament Commission.

66. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1 also singled out specific aspects in an imbalanced way. His delegation could not accept certain of its provisions. Its preambular part, for example, failed to take into account the legitimate defence needs of States and the fact that the military capabilities of States needed to reflect the military capability of its potential adversaries, both regional and non-regional. Moreover, the resolution emphasized conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels and failed to stress the need for global control of weapons of mass destruction. For those reasons his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1.

67. Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1 only on the understanding that the Conference on Disarmament would work within its assigned areas of competence, in conformity with its rules and procedures. It was important to avoid a situation in which the Conference duplicated the work of the Disarmament Commission.

68. Mr. BANDURA (Ukraine) said the draft resolutions in cluster 10 had many similar elements and that efforts should be made in future to merge such drafts into a single document on regional issues.

69. The entry into force in 1992 of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe had proven that regional negotiations were capable of promoting regional security and disarmament. Further consultations were now necessary, however, to take account of the changed circumstances in Europe. He hoped that other countries would be understanding of Ukraine's position on that matter. While

(Mr. Bandura, Ukraine)

his country pledged to comply fully with its treaty obligations, it wished to be able to define the rational deployment of its armed forces on Ukrainian territory in accordance with the principle of reasonable sufficiency.

70. Ms. MASON (Canada) said that, while her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1, it would have voted against the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs of the draft had separate votes been taken on those two paragraphs.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.